

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 ROBERT DAWSON,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 JOHN BAWDEN, et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. C21-1509JLR

ORDER

15 Before the court is Plaintiff Robert Dawson’s motion for reconsideration of the
16 court’s March 18, 2022 order dismissing Defendant Oracle Life Solutions, LLC
17 (“Oracle”) without prejudice. (Mot. (Dkt. # 10); *see also* 3/18/22 Order (Dkt. # 9).) Mr.
18 Dawson requests “an extension of time until May 1, 2022, for the parties to continue
19 settlement discussions, or in the alternative investigate alternative service means for
20 [Oracle].” (Mot. at 2.)

21 The court dismissed Oracle without prejudice based on Mr. Dawson’s failure to
22 respond to the court’s prior show cause order with either proof of service on Oracle or

1 justification for his failure to timely complete service. (3/18/22 at 1-2; OSC (Dkt. # 7).)
2 Mr. Dawson asserts in his motion that he “attempted service on [Oracle] on several
3 occasions,” but has been unsuccessful because, he believes, Oracle’s registered agent
4 “has been outside of the country since November 2021.” (*See* Mot. at 2.) Mr. Dawson
5 apparently intended to timely respond to the court’s show cause order with an affidavit
6 demonstrating his unsuccessful efforts to serve Oracle, but his counsel “inadvertently”
7 failed to complete the filing. (*See id.*) Attached to Mr. Dawson’s motion is an exhibit
8 containing several “declarations of non-service” of the summons and complaint on
9 Oracle, which show unsuccessful attempts to serve Oracle on November 14, 17, 18, and
10 20, 2021 and again on January 25, 2022. (*See id.* at 2 ¶ 5, Ex. A.)

11 “Motions for reconsideration are disfavored,” and “the court will ordinarily deny
12 such motions” unless the moving party shows (a) “manifest error in the prior ruling,” or
13 (b) “new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the] attention [of
14 the court] earlier with reasonable diligence.” Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(1). Mr.
15 Dawson does not argue that the court’s prior order contained manifest error, and he
16 presents no new facts or legal authority that could not have been brought to the court’s
17 attention earlier with reasonable diligence. (*See generally* Mot.; *id.*, Ex. A.) Indeed, he
18 acknowledges that his counsel intended to file the very information he now submits in
19 response to the court’s show cause order. (*See id.*) Unlike other forms of relief available
20 under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, negligence on the part of counsel does not
21 provide a reason for the court to reconsider its order. *Compare* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1)

22 //

1 (allowing courts to grant relief from an order based on “mistake, inadvertence, surprise,
2 or excusable neglect”), *with* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(1).

3 Accordingly, Mr. Dawson’s motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 10) is DENIED.
4 The court further DIRECTS Mr. Dawson to file a motion for relief under Federal Rule of
5 Civil Procedure 60(b) within fifteen (15) days of the date of this order.

6 Dated this 23rd day of March, 2022.

7 
8

9 JAMES L. ROBART
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22